

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 35 and 36 are pending in the present application. By the present amendment, claims 1, 2, 7, 10, and 35 have been amended to more particularly describe patentable features of applicants' invention. In addition, in response to the Examiner's request, a copy of the Abstract on a separate page has been attached hereto.

Claims 1, 7, 10, and 35 have been amended to address the § 112 rejection, in particular, the word "the" preceding the term "results" has been deleted. Claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,391 to Osborn. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of estimating results of a database query. Workload information is collected related to queries that have been executed on the database. Query patterns of the queries in the workload are traced to identify the usage of tuples in the database during execution of the queries. The usage of a given tuple relates to a relative frequency with which the given tuple was accessed by queries in the workload. A sample weight based on tuple usage is determined for each tuple. A weighted sampling of the database is performed based upon the sample weights. The database query is executed on the weighted sample to estimate results of the database query.

Osborn does not teach or suggest the method recited in claim 1. For example, Osborn does not identify the usage of a given tuple that relates to the frequency with which the tuple was accessed by queries in the workload. Nor does Osborn teach or suggest the step of assigning a weight to a tuple based on the usage or the step of executing the database query on the sample to obtain estimate results of the query. Claim 2 has been amended to clarify the feature of assigning a weight to a tuple based on usage as discussed above. For these reasons, claim 1 and its depending claims 2 -6 are in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 7 and 10 have been amended in a manner analogous to claim 1 and are in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. Dependent claims 8-9 are, therefore, also in condition for allowance.

Claim 35 stands rejected as obvious in view of Osborn combined with Acharya. Claim 35 has been amended to overcome the rejection with respect to Osborn as discussed with respect to claim 1. Claims 35 and 36 are hence in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing discussion it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are patentably distinct from the prior art and each from the other and this application is in condition for allowance. Prompt notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-0630 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

Jennifer Nock Hinton
Reg. No. 47,653

Telephone (216) 241-6700
Telefacsimile (216) 241-8151